

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Claims 1,2,4, and 6-12 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petell (US Patent No. 5,738,360) in view of Blankenburg (US Patent No. 5,207,454). Petell discloses the roller skate with a curved frame, a plurality of rotating rollers 20, 22, 24 and a front roller 30 serving as a point stop. Blankenburg discloses the use of ball supports.

With regard to claim 1, both skates of Petell and Blankenburg have limitations typical to that of most roller skates. Most notably, they do not allow the user to perform ALL maneuvers that can be done with ice skates. There are three most important types of such maneuvers: jumps, rotations (spins), and steps. Petell skate would indeed allow the user to jump by using the front point stop, same as the Applicant's skate. However, Petell fails to disclose the design of the skate allowing the user to turn during rotations using both the front point stop AND the next supporting element such as a ball support in the Applicant's invention. Using the skate by Petell, the user has to rely only on the front point stop to turn, same as with jumps, which puts unduly high frictional load on that front point stop and may cause its premature failure. Besides, it forces the user to bend the foot to a much steeper angle in order to lift the entire roller skate off the skating surface, which may cause an increased muscle fatigue and reduce the duration of skating exercise. Petell does not disclose any provisions to allow the steps maneuver, which usually includes sliding along the curves and rotations by half or full turn, combined with changing from one leg to the other. Such maneuvers require the user to rely on the tail ball support, which is entirely absent from the design of Petell's skate. There is no mentioning in Petell about the ability of the user to perform such maneuvers.

Blankenburg does indeed disclose the use of several ball rollers designed to allow side movements of the user. Blankenburg does not however disclose the use of a combination of a

front point stop immediately followed by a ball roller, which is critical in performing jumps and rotation using both of these elements for supporting the user on the skating surface. There is no indication on Blankenburg of the need or the ability of his skate to perform these maneuvers in such advantageous way as to not overload the front point stop as discussed above. Steps are also not covered by the Blankenburg's invention as the frame of the skate is not curved.

As to claim 2, it has been amended to include a limitation of fixing the roller with a removable pin, which has not been disclosed by the prior art. The advantage of a removable pin is the ability to turn the roller periodically to ensure uniform wear.

Claims 3,4, and 6 have been canceled. Claims 7- 10 and especially claims 11 and 12 describe the specific distances and geometry of the frame that are critical for the particular combination of design elements described in claim 1 to ensure that all of the common maneuvers can be performed easily by the user.

Claims 1, and 5-12 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner (US Patent No. 1,868,548) in view of Blankenburg (US Patent No. 5,207,454). Turner describes a skate similar in design to that of Petel so the discussion above regarding the non-obvious nature of claims 1, and 5-12 is applicable here as well.

Claim 3 is rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petell (US Patent No. 5,738,360) in view of Blankenburg (US Patent No. 5,207,454) and Nelson (US Patent No. 5,486,011). Applicant cancels claim 3.

In conclusion, the most unique feature of the Applicant's invention is the combination of the curved frame, the front end point stop and the front ball support located immediately thereafter on the frame of the skate ahead of the main row of rollers. This combination of features is not fairly suggested or taught by the prior art. It allows performing the rotation and steps maneuver supporting the skate not only on the front point stop (as would be needed using

the skates of the prior art) but also on the front ball support. This allows unloading the front point stop from high frictional wear and distributing the weight load throughout the entire front portion of the skate. It also makes it easier for the user to perform such a maneuver, as it requires a lower degree of lifting the skate off the surface. Adding a tail ball support completes the design of the skate allowing steps to be performed easily as well as jumps and rotations.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Boris Leschinsky, Applicants' Agent at 201-262-0051 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

5/5/05
Date

Boris Leschinsky
Boris Leschinsky
Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 41404

Boris Leschinsky
Patent Agent
P.O.Box 72
Waldwick, NJ 07463
Tel. 201-262-0051